

OFFICIAL TRANSMISSION

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-15, 17-25, 27-31 and 33 are pending in the present application. In the above amendments, claims 1, 8, 11, 18, 21, 28 and 31 have been amended, and claims 6, 16, 26 and 32 have been canceled without prejudice.

Applicant respectfully responds to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112

Claims 21-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112. Claim 21 has been amended to clarify the invention.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kim et al., in view of Park et al.

Section 706.02(j) provides that, in order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First there must be some suggestion or motivation either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. Section 706.02(j), further provides that, "To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references." Ex parte Clapp, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

OFFICIAL TRANSMISSION

Independent claims 1, 11 and 21 are amended to incorporate the recitations of claims 6, 16 and 26, respectively. Regarding claims 1, 11 and 21, the claims recite "...utilizing *adaptive block* size discrete cosine transforms (ABSDCT), emphasis added." Even though Kim reference discloses DCT techniques, the Kim reference does not expressly or impliedly suggest the utilizing adaptive block size DCT. This technique is also not discussed or suggested in the Park reference.

Claims 8, 18 and 28 are converted into independent claims. Independent claim 31 is amended to include the recitations of claim 32. Regarding claims 8, 18, 28 and 31, the claims similarly recites, among other elements, "filtering *each element of each column of the block*, where given an m^{th} column, weighting column $m-1$ 25%, weighting column m 50%, and weighting column $m+1$ filtering further comprises 25%," emphasis added. The Examiner provided portion of reference (Kim: col 12, lines 8-61) as reason for concluding that obviousness. It is not clear how the examiner reached this conclusion. The provided portion of the reference (Kim: col 12, lines 8-61) does not expressly or impliedly show the weighting recitations as claimed. This technique is also not discussed or suggested in the Park reference.

Regarding claim 33, the claim recites among other elements, "separating the digital image into Y , C_b and C_r components; dividing the C_b and C_r components into a plurality of blocks utilizing adaptive block size discrete cosine transforms (ABSDCT), wherein each block may be represented as a plurality of columns (m), each column m comprising a plurality of elements; and selectively filtering each element of each column of the block, where given an m^{th} column, the step of filtering further comprises: weighting column $m-1$ 25%; weighting column m 50%; and weighting column $m+1$ 25%." The Examiner uses (Kim: col 6, lines 32-65) and (Kim: col 10, lines 10-50) to establish the step of "dividing the C_b and C_r components into a plurality of blocks utilizing adaptive block size discrete cosine transforms (ABSDCT), wherein each block may be represented as a plurality of columns (m), each column m comprising a plurality of elements." However, the reference used does not expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed recitation. The Examiner's reasoning in reaching the conclusion is not clear. The sections merely discusses discrete cosine transforms techniques and fail to expressly or impliedly suggest how "dividing the C_b and C_r components into a plurality of blocks utilizing adaptive block size discrete cosine transforms (ABSDCT)" is established. Additionally, the Examiner uses (Kim: Col 12, lines 20-40

OFFICIAL TRANSMISSION

and Col 12, line 60 – Col 13, line 10) to establish “selectively filtering each element of each column of the block, where given an m^{th} column, the step of filtering further comprises: weighting column $m-1$ 25%; weighting column m 50%; and weighting column $m+1$ 25%.” This technique is not expressly or impliedly suggested nor disclosed by the reference used by the examiner. The cited portions of reference merely show a method of weighting and filtering. However, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art use the cited references (Kim and Park) to invent the claimed invention.

Thus, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the reference and an allowance. Otherwise respectfully requests the Examiner to provide a convincing line of reasoning and non-final office action providing clarifications.

OFFICIAL TRANSMISSION

REQUEST FOR ALLOWANCE

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all pending claims in the application are patentable. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of this application are earnestly solicited. Should any issues remain unresolved, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned at the number provided below.

Please charge Deposit Account No. 17-0026 of QUALCOMM Incorporated the amount of \$258 for additional 3 independent claims. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to said Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: _____

By: _____

Milan Patel, Reg. No. 41,242
(858) 651-6892

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-5787
Facsimile: (858) 658-2502

Attorney Docket No.: 010327
Customer No.: 23696